

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

TERENCE CRAWLEY,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. CIV-21-00201-PRW
	)	
WARDEN OF THE FEDERAL	)	
TRANSFER CENTER,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**ORDER**

On May 7, 2021, United States Magistrate Judge Shon T. Erwin issued a Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 5) in this action, recommending that Petitioner Terence Crawley's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (Dkt. 1) be dismissed without prejudice for failure to file the Petition using the proper form and for failure to pay the filing fee or, in the alternative, to obtain leave to proceed without prepayment of fees. The Court ordered Petitioner to address these deficiencies by April 1, 2021 or else have this action dismissed without prejudice to refiling (Dkt. 4). To date, Plaintiff has neither cured said deficiencies nor responded to the Court's Order in any way.


Petitioner was advised that he had a right to object to the Report and Recommendation by May 24, 2021, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72, and that failure to make a timely objection would waive any right to appellate review of the factual and legal issues addressed in the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 5). No objections have been filed as of this date. Having failed to

object, Petitioner has accordingly waived his right to appellate review of the factual and legal issues addressed in the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 5).<sup>1</sup>

Upon review of the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 5), the Court:

- (1) **ADOPTS** in full the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 5) issued by the Magistrate Judge on May 7, 2021; and
- (2) **DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO REFILE** Petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (Dkt. 1).

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 2nd day of June 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PATRICK R. WYRICK  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> *United States v. One Parcel of Real Prop.*, 73 F.3d 1057, 1059–60 (10th Cir. 1996); *Moore v. United States*, 950 F.2d 656, 659 (10th Cir. 1991); *cf.* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring a district judge to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made” but otherwise permitting a district judge to review the report and recommendations under any standard it deems appropriate).